

Rothschilds & Rockefellers: Dedicated Monopolists

BY ELBERT O. KELSEY

The names "Rothschild" and "Rockefeller" have long since come to be used as collective nouns when reference is made to the enormous fortresses of money-power they grabbed and continue to control. As collective nouns it should be understood at the start that in this article their use includes "in-laws", heirs and leading "frontmen." Under the heading "Rockefeller" are some Aldrichs, Carnegies, Harknesses, Rogers, Pratts, Flaglers, and Stillmans. Under the "Rothschild" heading, because they were far more numerous at their beginning and have been going longer, the list is much bigger. It includes some Baruchs, Belmonts, Bischoffsheims, Goldschmitts, Gunzbergs, Lazards, Harrimans, Rhodes, Lewisohns, Oppenheimers, Guggenheims, Ryans, Schiffs, Seligmans, and Warburgs. Both camps, of course, had many other early lesser lights and late recruits to their standards.

THOSE WHO purposefully enter the fight against atheistic Communisms are bound to learn soon that their task is made infinitely harder by individuals and groups who, while pretending to belong among true capitalists, are, in fact, strangers or worse, to the productive enterprise system which is called "Capitalism."

We owe to the modern practice of word-kidnapping and meaning-mutilation the existence in America and abroad of a relatively small, but powerful, number of self-styled "Capitalists" who are nothing under the sun but masquerading heirs (spiritual or otherwise) of those dedicated monopolists: Rothschilds and Rockefellers. This is most convenient for them. But it places a heavy and undeserved burden upon true capitalists, because their campaigns to defend capitalism against its enemies automatically has the result of also defending masqueraders in its name.

The term "Capitalism," properly used, denotes *productive enterprise under which privately owned and managed wealth ("Capital") is utilized to produce MORE wealth*. It is harmonious with the best in Anglo-Saxon and American tradition. It can be a natural, wholesome, and equitable arrangement of social and economic relationships among rational, enlightened and self-interested human beings. It squares with the Golden Rule of Christian ethics just as completely as it does with the even older universal ethic which the ancient Greeks tersely expressed thus: "*It is unnatural, therefore wrong, for some men to seek gain at the expense of other men.*"

Capitalism which respects that ethic is not only good for capitalists; it also contributes to the spread of freedom in ever-widening circles among all mankind. That kind of capitalism is worth defending with our lives and our every

energy and resource. To more fully realize this we only need remind ourselves that the derivation of the word "freedom" relates to wealth. ("*Wela*"—Early Anglo-Saxon for "well-being.")

"Freedom," in old Norse mythology, was the domain ("dom"), jointly presided over by "Freya," the goddess of LOVE, and her brother "Frey," god of PROSPERITY and PRODUCTIVITY!

True capitalism, the kind it is right to practice and defend, therefore, is not even a "distant cousin" of social and economic practices which seek gain for some at the expense of others. True capitalists are *not required to defend, or even tolerate*, persons who, or practices which, illicitly seek capitalism's protective coloration.

It is perhaps Satan's bizarre notion of justice that both the Rothschild and Rockefeller citadels of great money-power were initially sprung from human ignorance and suffering.

Beginning of Rothschild Riches

All the protestations of highly paid public opinion-shapers notwithstanding these truths remain:

a. The beginning of the Rothschild riches goes back to a share of the money profit resulting from sale of 22,000 human beings, bought by King George III for \$3,141,000. The seller was the Hessian tyrant, Frederick II. The Hessians were wanted to kill North American Colonists whom their fellows in England refused to fight. A ghetto pawnbroker in Frankfort by the name of Meyer Anselm Bauer had become "court banker" and business agent for Frederick. Dropping the name "Bauer" and assuming the name "Rothschild" (Roth: "red"; schild: "shield"), he, with his patron, waxed rich. The patron sold his subjects as slave-soldiers for money; Bauer (turned "Rothschild") put that money out on shares at usury. He was the founder of the Rothschild dynasty.

b. According to page 12 of the book *John D.—A Portrait in Oils* by John K. Winkler, the beginning of the Rocke-

feller riches goes back to money profits from sale (at outlandish prices) of deceptively labeled bottles of ordinary crude petroleum—as a "*Guaranteed Cure*" for Cancer! With that introduction of old William Avery Rockefeller into the oil business, it is asking too much for us to believe, as kept-biographers harp, that his son, "John D." started on his own money grabbing career with nothing but his bare hands and a noble soul.

Those two early puddles of Rothschild and Rockefeller money-power, each started so cruelly, have become almost bottomless reservoirs of money-power today. For all the philanthropic good that some segments of that money concentration throws off (*and some good is done*), that good is outweighed beyond hope of redress by incalculable harm.

The most devastating possible argument against Capitalism, from an anti-Capitalist standpoint, is, first, to identify Rothschilds and Rockefellers under that label, and then, tell the unvarnished truth about the origin and development of their riches.

Those are bitter indictments but, since they are true, let us face them.

The instrumentalities by which the Rothschilds and Rockefellers originated, preserve, and continually increase their money-powers are as alike as two bullets from the same gun.

The Money Monopolies

Their aims are and always have been toward the same targets: **MONOPOLIES**:

a. Monopoly over sources of elementary human needs; natural resources;

b. Monopoly over the facilities for supplying the human needs of public enlightenment; education, publishing, communication;

c. Monopoly over the necessities of commerce; money, credit and transportation.

A few examples of these monopolies will suffice:

The Rothschilds early acquired a monopoly on the world's best mercury mines in Italy and Spain; diamond mine in Africa; gold mines in North America and South Africa; tin in the East Indies and Bolivia; and in cooperation with their allies and henchmen in America (Rockefellers, Guggenheims, Ryans, and Lewisohns) a complete, or near-complete, monopoly on copper in North and South America and Africa.

In the field of public enlightenment we will mention only such unquestioned allies of the predatory money-powers as: *The London Times*; *The New York Times*; Rhodes Scholarships; Rockefeller-financed University of Chicago; Rothschild-financed London School of Economics; Rockefeller-financed Teacher's College (Columbia University), General Education Board; and *Life Magazine*.

In the field of money, credit and transportation we will merely spot-check. Transportation: Rothschild-Warburg-Harriman's Union Pacific Railroad. The same interests are (or were until railroading profits started down grade) dominant in many other rail systems in North and South America and Europe. They owned the British railroads until operating losses made it good business to let them be "nationalized."

Since Meyer Anselm Bauer left his pawnship, changed his name to Rothschild and entered big-scale money-lending in Frankfurt, the family, in-laws, heirs and agents have been the money and credit monopolists over most of the civilized world. **THAT MONOPOLY RESTED UPON THEIR DELIBERATE ACQUISITION OF CONTROL OF EACH MAJOR NATION'S PRIVATELY OWNED FRACTIONAL RESERVE CENTRAL BANK OF MONEY ISSUE:**

British Empire, Bank of England; Belgium (until 1934), Banque Societe General Belgique; France, Bank of

France; Austria (until 1931), Austrian Creditanstalt; Netherlands, The Netherlands Bank; Germany (until 1870), M. A. Rothschild & Sohne; Germany (after 1870), (and satellites) Reichbank. (Bank of Prussia, named later changed to "Reichbank," was organized by Ludwig Bamberger, a Socialist comrade in earlier days of Karl Marx. Bamberger was Rothschild kinsman. He hated Germans. The Reichbank was his deliberate curse upon them! Like its counterparts in other countries, most notably France and England, the Reichbank in time ruined the nation's money system.)

Prior to World War I the Romanoffs had successfully barred the Rothschilds from operating banks in Russia. (See Banker's Blueprint for Ruin, *AMERICAN MERCURY*, July, 1956.)

The absence of a privately owned central bank of issue in the United States (after 1836 and prior to 1913) limited the Rothschilds' banking activities to control of individual state or nationally chartered banks. They had to compete with native and patriotic men such as J. P. Morgan, until the first administration of President Woodrow Wilson, when the alien Federal Reserve Act was passed in imitation of the Bank of England, Reichbank, etc. Wilson, advised by Bernard Baruch, promptly named Paul M. Warburg first governor of the Federal Reserve Board. The head of the Rothschild camel thereupon was inside our tent.

Rockefellers Come Later

The Rockefellers came upon the monopoly-grabbing scene after the Rothschilds had already made great progress. However, the discovery of petroleum in the mid-nineteenth century was soon followed by realization that its kerosene derivative was superior to whale oil as a fuel for lamps (gasoline engines weren't yet invented). After the early pandering of the newly discovered liquid as a "guaranteed cure" for cancer, the old medical duck, William Avery

Rockefeller, gave his son his start in marketing it as a luminant. A fuller story of the methods employed by the Rockefellers to capture their oil monopoly will be told another time in this series. It is enough to say here that it was captured by resort to crimes against man, including every ruthless economic practice ever invented by man: below-cost-selling until competitors quit, railroad freight rebates and draw-backs, terrorism, violence and just plain cussedness and deviltry. But it got the desired results. *By the beginning of the twentieth century the Rockefellers' oil company was a monopoly.*

That it was not a *total* monopoly was due entirely to a few struggling independents who refused to be bullied, cowed, or otherwise crowded out of business. But nothing less than final extermination of those few would have been tolerated by Rockefellers had not the "trust bonding" crusade of President Theodore Roosevelt brought results.

Ohio courts outlawed the oil monopoly; the Rockefellers were fined \$29,000, 000, and the state of Texas issued an injunction against the Rockefellers' doing business in that state. In 1911 the United States Supreme Court ordered dissolution of the company.

The Rockefellers wriggled out of paying the fine; parcelled out ownership of their empire among a dozen or so newly formed corporations; and continued in business, still owning "working control" of the many pieces of the former whole. Judge Landis said, "You can't convict a million dollars."

It here should be asserted on behalf of *true capitalists*, that once the old Rockefeller Oil Monopoly had been chopped into pieces by the Supreme Court Order, given half a chance to compete on anything near even terms, the few surviving independents demonstrated that they could find oil, refine it, and market its products just as efficiently as the monopoly ever had been able

to do. The scores of big and successful American oil companies today at home and abroad are witness to the resourcefulness and character of the decent pioneers who refused to please Rockefeller by quitting. The American people can thank them for the fact that here neither the several "Standard Oil" companies nor any others hold a complete monopoly on the oil reserves, refineries, or marketing facilities of the oil industry.

By 1911, when the old monopoly was outlawed, John D. Rockefeller, who had been its moral and intellectual sire, decided to retire from management of the business and devote his talents to preserving his money-power intact. His riches *then were estimated at one thousand million dollars* — equivalent to about FIVE BILLION 1958 DOLLARS. That was John D.'s personal share. (We do not have figures for brother William, or for Flaglers, Harknesses, etc., etc.)

During the brawls which attended the creation of the Oil Monopoly, Rockefellers quickly learned the convenience of carefully handcarved public opinion. They began early to be openhanded with synthetic reputation manufacturers such as Ivy Lee. (Lee made a fortune over the years "laundering" the Rockefeller name.) The result was bound to be that John D. would want all his philanthropies to "earn their keep," as it were. He wanted recipients of his "philanthropy" to *say what he wanted said and to teach what he wanted taught*. In short, he was a "string-attached-giver."

In 1890, he promised to endow the University of Chicago with a gift of \$600,000 IF others would raise another \$400,000. That was one "string." The other was that the so-called "nonsectarian" institution's *Board of Trustees must have a majority of BAPTISTS*. As for the tainted source of the endowment, John D. shifted blame for the Oil Monopoly onto the Creator! "God," said the old hypocrite, "gave me the money."

In 1901, he endowed the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. Remembering the "guaranteed cure" for cancer of Rockefeller's younger years, one cannot escape echoing Burke's cynical crack "... the usual fruit of a late penitence."

Congress had for years refused a charter to the Rockefeller Foundation. After Baruch ushered Woodrow Wilson into the White House, a charter to the Rockefeller Foundation was granted. Then in 1914 the General Education Board; in 1918 Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial; and in 1928 the Spellman Fund.

No one outside the Rockefeller family knows how much was given to the various funds or what their resources now total. By any estimate they are astronomical. Even so, only a fraction of Rockefeller riches ever really left the "beneficial interest" status of Rockefeller heirs.

In 1903, Dr. Simon Flexner, one of three busy brothers, became director of laboratories of the Rockefeller Institute. In 1908, Abraham Flexner became education "expert" for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In 1913, Abraham Flexner left Carnegie's Foundation and joined his brother at Rockefellers'. When the Rockefellers' General Education Board was created he became its first secretary.

From then on over the years that followed those two Flexners had big voices in the affairs and policies of the Rockefeller-endowed foundations. Abraham Flexner, particularly, left his mark upon the face of American education. He and Professor John Dewey, Columbia philosopher, *VIA University of Chicago*, can claim more responsibility for the breakdown of American education than their hundred next closest competitors!

Of Dr. Simon Flexner, at the Institute of Medicine, we need only add that he worked as a stalwart member of the triumvirate.

The third Flexner brother, Bernard,

was a politico-lawyer. Early in the administration of Woodrow Wilson he was made a handyman for the President in the District of Columbia. He joined the notorious Roger N. Baldwin (long-time director of the ultraliberal American Liberties Union), in authoring a book; and in 1918-19 was Counsel for the Zionist Delegation to the Peace Conference.

Great significance attends the gaining of high position in the giant money-power foundations. We just saw it in our brief glimpse of the Flexners.

One can search a long time without finding a more illuminating expression of that significance than is on Pages 534-35, Volume V, of *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, 1931, Edited by Columbia University Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman, son of banker Joseph Seligman:

It can scarcely be denied that the foundation as representative of the private will operating through the power of wealth can more readily compass certain purposes. For example, there is an increasing tendency for activities of recent foundations to take on an international character that state action, as it has been hitherto contrived under the influence of nationalistic ideas, seems hardly disposed to assume . . ."

Credit Control

The two money-grabbing sons of the old medical duck, William A. Rockefeller, realized at an early age that fractional reserve banks are extremely handy things to control. *Ability to extend credit here, while withholding credit there*, gives the money lender a stranglehold on every individual or business which needs to borrow. Here, indeed, is a nearly-ideal mechanism whereby some men can gain at the expense of other men:

(Continued on Page 56)

enough for other exercise. They sit too much because they get out of breath easily. But by walking and exercising with oxygen support, they can build up their physical strength and help their bodies work more efficiently.

Positive pressure breathing apparatus is used often in emphysema. These devices force air (or medication) into the lungs under pressure to help equalize ventilation in the lungs.

Activity is Desirable

If at all possible, a person with emphysema should be active and hold a job. Motivation is extremely important, and with their physician's encouragement, many persons have even come out of retirement to take jobs successfully.

Sometimes a person with only 10 per cent lung capacity remaining is working, while another individual, with 40 per cent, isn't well enough to leave the

house. Work helps to keep a patient well.

Because community air contamination plays a role in emphysema, large cities should issue a daily pollution count, similar to the pollen tallies published during the hay fever season. When pollution is high, individuals with emphysema can be warned to be relatively inactive.

Small meals rather than heavy ones are recommended for emphysema patients, because overloading the stomach can interfere with breathing. Peptic ulcer is 10 times more common among individuals with emphysema than in the general population, although doctors aren't sure precisely why.

If caught in the early stages, treatment of emphysema is more successful, just as in early tuberculosis or diabetes. But because it is a chronic disease, its victims do need good therapy for the rest of their lives.

Rothschilds & Rockefellers

(Continued from Page 53)

William A. Rockefeller, Jr., long ago bought a controlling stock interest in The National City Bank of New York; and John D. Rockefeller bought control of the Chase National Bank.

John D. Rockefeller's grandson, David, now is Vice-Chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank (understudy of Chairman John J. McCloy). His (McCloy's) wife is a Zinnser and Mrs. McCloy's sister is married to Conrad Adenauer of West Germany). It is the *largest bank* in the financial center of the world—New York City.

William A. Rockefeller, Jr.'s grandson, James S., now is President of The First National City Bank. It is the *second largest bank* in New York City.

As of December 31, 1957, the two banks controlled, directly, bank deposits totaling more than \$13,577,000,000. (THIRTEEN BILLION, FIVE HUNDRED SEVENTY-SEVEN MILLION)

With the Rothschilds enjoying monopolistic banking power in Europe; and with the Rothschilds-Rockefellers enjoying similar power in the United States, one need not wonder that the two predatory clans find so much reason to harmonize actions, each with the other. From their monopolistic point of view, therefore, what could be more useful to that "harmony" than to confront New York State voters in the November elections with this dilemma:

They either will continue to have a "Democratic" Governor in the person of the Rothschild front boy, Averill Harriman; or a "Republican" Governor in the person of an in-the-flesh Rockefeller!

Suit yourself! We plan to go into the woods that day to gather hazelnuts. It will be so much more rewarding!

(To be continued)